



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: Robert Baker, et al.

Serial No: 10/621,221

Filed: July 16, 2003

For: System and Method for Interpreting  
Repeated Surfaces

§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§

Group Art Unit: 2857

Examiner: McElheny, Jr.

Attorney Docket: D9546-00004

**RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION**

Mail Stop Amendment  
Commissioner For Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sirs:

Applicants respond to the Office Action dated April 7, 2005 as set forth below

I. REMARKS

A. The Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) and (b)

In paragraph 2 of the Office Action, claim 14 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) and (b) as being anticipated by Van Bemmell. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 14 is not anticipated by Van Bemmell.

Applicants note that the Office Action does not specify how Van Bemmell anticipates each limitation found in claim 14, making it difficult to determine the basis for rejection. However, Applicants submit that claim 14 is not anticipated by Van Bemmell for at least the reasons set forth below. If this is not sufficient to allow claim 14, Applicants respectfully request a specific explanation regarding how Van Bemmell discloses each limitation of the claim.

Claim 14 comprises the limitation "a seismic data set computer program resident in the computer, adapted to relate to a plurality of data structures containing seismic data representative of horizons which comprise a repeated surface to form a logically connected horizons data set